



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

(for *Romanae*); 42, *peragitur*. Several emendations are suggested in the appendix but not adopted in the text: 26, *versuras*; 34, *sed superesse*; 34, [*Druso*]; 36, *fracti* (for *tracti*). A new and rather plausible conjecture adopted in the text is *horrentes capilli retro sequuntur . . . religantur* (38). Dr. Gudeman makes a strong argument against the accepted readings here, but does not do justice to the manuscript reading. Another new conjecture is 3, *et apud eos* (for *apud eos et*).

The commentary, as indicated above, is very full. Like that in the American edition, it contains numerous comments on the rhetorical devices of the *Germania*. It is also particularly rich in parallels for the meanings of words and for their uses in phrases. Dr. Gudeman believes that the resemblance of the opening lines of the *Germania* (*Germania omnis a Gallis Raetisque et Pannoniis Rheno et Danuvio fluminibus, a Sarmatis Dacisque mutuo metu aut montibus separatur*) to the beginning of Caesar's Gallic War is accidental. To me it seems a deliberate imitation—with a difference. By the inconcinnity of *metu* and *montibus* Tacitus intentionally indicates the difference between his rhetorical style and Caesar's simple style.

In Chapter 5 Tacitus tells us that the Germans prefer money which is *veterem et diu notam, serratos bigatosque*. Dr. Gudeman now says that Tacitus is either exaggerating or using an early source, as few such coins (which antedate 53 B. C.) have been found in Germany. But perhaps Tacitus is using his own more vivid expression, *serratos bigatosque*, in explanation of *veterem*. An analogy for this is the expression *vinum consulare*. Dr. Gudeman does not explain why the Germans preferred old money. The answer is implicit in *diu notam*: probably the Romans worked off spurious coins on them, *ut nunc*.

In Chapter 7 Dr. Gudeman reverts to an old explanation of *hortamina* as 'liquid refreshments'. For this he finds new parallels. But the thought of the next sentence would seem to indicate that the word has the original meaning of 'encouragement'.

In the American edition Dr. Gudeman, commenting on Chapter 9, found substantiation for supposing that the Germans worshiped natural objects, like the sun and the moon, as well as other gods, in the names of the days of the week: Sunday, Monday, as against Tuesday, etc. He overlooked the fact that the days of the week were named after the planets, not the gods. The statement has been omitted in the German edition.

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

B. L. ULLMAN

History of Europe. Ancient and Medieval. By James Henry Breasted and James Harvey Robinson. Boston: Ginn and Company (1920). Pp. xiii + 665.

This review is confined to that portion of the volume which is included within Books I—IV, dealing with Earliest Man, The Orient, The Greeks, and The Romans. Professor Breasted, in these Books, covers the same ground which he had covered before in his numer-

ous other publications, especially in his earlier textbooks, *Outlines of European History* (1914), and *Ancient Times* (1916—see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 10. 199-200). The present volume is based on the author's *Outlines of European History*. But the material has been condensed and quite thoroughly rewritten and rearranged. Many shifts in emphasis are the result and practically all are for the better. "More space has been given to Roman history and less to that of the ancient Orient", the Introduction tells us (iv). This is an improvement; but even now too large a proportion has been allotted to that earlier civilization, as the following figures show: 64 pages to the Orient, 111 pages to the Greeks, and 100 pages to the Romans. Formerly, as a protest against the blindness of historians to the indebtedness of Greece and Rome to the ancient Orient, a little overstress was pardonable, perhaps necessary. Such blindness no longer exists; so manifestly Professor Breasted's full knowledge of, and enthusiasm for, the Oriental field have disturbed his sense of proportion. For he has been guilty of a sin which the Introduction ascribes to former textbooks on universal history: "The older books tended to give too much attention to the remote past and too little information in regard to recent history".

The extreme condensation necessary in so brief a manual makes adequate treatment of many important topics impossible. For example, there is no direct information given as to how the Delian League was transformed into an Athenian Empire, beyond the bare statement of that fact and the mention of the transferring of the treasury from Delos to Athens (131, 132, 150). The description of the battle of Leuctra, on page 160, is silent about the innovations in military science and practice which were among the chief factors in Alexander's easy conquest of Asia. Less than ten lines are devoted to the struggle of Demosthenes against Philip (170), in spite of all that contest symbolizes for every age. The story of the First Carthaginian War is told in one page. The student who uses this text-book will know nothing about the traditional 'slimness' of Roman diplomacy which precipitated the war and which helps to explain the rapid advance of Rome in the Mediterranean world. The work of the Gracchi is similarly dismissed in one page (230), which can not, and does not, give an adequate conception of the scope and of the importance of their attempted reforms. We hear nothing of the Mithridatic Wars and may well wonder what was going on in Asia Minor to call Sulla away from Rome and from his opponent Marius (234). These omissions are typical and, perhaps, unavoidable under the circumstances.

In regard to some matters of fact one might hold different opinions from those of Professor Breasted. The statement on page 95 concerning the authorship of the Homeric poems should have taken into account the very recent work done in this country on Homer. Certainly the Unitarians are having their inning to-day. On page 112 the severity of the Draconian code is affirmed without sufficient qualification; the most important laws, those dealing with homicide, were merciful

for the period. In regard to Caesar's campaign in Spain against the Pompeians we read (238): "With his customary swiftness he was in Spain by June (49 B. C.). Here, by cutting off their supplies, he forced Pompey's commanders to surrender without a battle". This misstatement may be due to an effort to economize space. The fighting was very severe in the operations in front of Ilerda. Only after Caesar had been repulsed with serious loss and had narrowly escaped disaster did he finally catch Afranius and Petreius between the Sicoris and the Ebro, cut off their supplies, and force a surrender without further fighting. Professor Breasted repeats Plutarch's story of Antony's infatuation for Cleopatra as determining his action at Alexandria (241). Ferrero has very plausibly brought to the fore the political considerations which made such a union desirable. One should amend the statements on page 253 by stressing the capriciousness rather than the cruelty of Nero's despotism. But these are minor matters which do not detract from the quality of the book as a whole.

To compress within 300 pages, for text-book purposes, the history of the ancient world from earliest man down to the German invasions is a task of doubtful utility. My personal experience in teaching history to pupils in the Preparatory School (a very brief experience, I frankly confess) has seemed to indicate that they must have a liberal background of past *events* before they can be brought to understand past *conditions*, past *institutions*, and past *ideas*. This book might well be put into the hands of pupils who had studied ancient history more in detail and who desired a rapid approach to the history of medieval and modern times. With this reservation the work of Professor Breasted is worthy of the highest praise. Such severe economy of space demands frequent summarizing of periods. Nowhere, in an elementary text-book, have these summaries been better done. The author's recognition of the organic unity of history pervades the whole work and the importance of a knowledge of the past for the understanding of the present is everywhere strongly felt by the reader.

Excellent illustrations are interspersed through the book, many in colors. Not only are they numerous and felicitously chosen, but under each is a long descriptive legend which makes the illustrations an integral part of the text and leaves nothing to the uncertain information of the teacher. The maps are, on the whole, adequate. On page 178 the student is referred to the map on page 176 for Antioch; the site of the city, however, is not indicated there. An Appendix contains a selected bibliography of nineteen pages, with proper guidance of teacher and pupil to the most helpful and most accessible books, and a carefully compiled Index. The references to Professor Breasted's earlier book, *Ancient Times* scattered through the text should in any future revision be relegated to the footnotes. A careful reading has disclosed no typographical errors.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

WILLIAM STUART MESSER

HARVARD STUDIES IN CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY VOLUME XXXI

Volume XXXI of Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, dated in 1920, contains four articles, as follows: The Religious Background of the Prometheus Vincetus, by J. A. K. Thomson (1-37); "Τότερον Πρότερον Ὀμηρικῶς", Samuel E. Bassett (39-62); The Spirit of Comedy in Plato, William Chase Greene (63-123); Ithaca: A Study of the Homeric Evidence, Frank Brewster (125-166).

Professor Thomson is an English scholar, who was in residence as teacher at Harvard University 1919-1920. Professor Thomson holds that the Prometheus was not primarily concerned with the stealing of fire or with the invention of the arts or with the destiny of man. Both the Prometheus Vincetus and the Prometheus Solutus, and perhaps the whole trilogy, "has for its spring the fact that Prometheus knows who is destined to overthrow Zeus, and refuses to tell. That is why—and not, after all, because he stole the fire—that he is punished in the play. And that is why, when he reveals the secret, he is released".

Part of Professor Thomson's summing-up runs as follows (34-35: it is especially interesting in view of Professor Prentice's discussion of this play, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 15.26-29):

Behind the immediate question which divides Zeus and Prometheus, who is to be the next King of the Gods, rises the larger question of the respective values of the old and the new *régime*, the rule of the Titans and the rule of Zeus. Prometheus, although at first he had sided with Zeus against his brethren, in the *Vincetus* has definitely ranged himself on the side of the Titans. Now to the Greek mind, and perhaps more particularly to the Athenian mind, the Titans stood for something very definite. They were the forces of lawlessness The service of Zeus was to introduce law and order into the government of the universe. It is easy for us to admit the truth of this in words; it is not easy to realize the intensity of Greek emotion about it. In the centuries between us and ancient Hellas the balance of material power has shifted. The advantage of force is now with Civilization and not with Barbarism: at least we have grown up in that belief. Accordingly we have acquired the habit of regarding the Barbarian with toleration and even a certain admiration, more or less sincere, for his picturesqueness and naturalness. That is because we no longer fear him The ancient Greek was not insensible to the romantic attraction of Barbarism. But he was in constant and deadly peril from it, and therefore in acute fear of it. So he came to attach what seems to us an excessive value to the virtues in which the Barbarian is specially deficient—self-control and respect for the law. Hellenism is the correlative of Barbarism. It was in contact with the Barbarian, Thucydides tells us, that Hellenism first became conscious of itself. Liberty . . . , according to the Greek maxim, is the Reign of Law, and Hellenism is based on *Eleutheria*. In Greek religion the Titans represented, at least to reflective minds, the spirit of lawlessness: they were the Barbarians of the divine world. Zeus on the other hand represented the Reign of Law. . . (Plato, *Crit. ad fin.*). Not only Plato but Aeschylus speaks like this. Zeus may have been relentless enough at first, but he did at least check the anarchy of the Titans and establish a Law. Hence Greek sympathy is with Zeus, because Greek sympathy is with the Law.